

## **REMARKS**

### **Entry of Amendment**

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

### **Allowance of Claims**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 53, 57-65, 69-84 and 87. Applicant is amending Claims 39, 44 and 49 to correct minor informalities therein. These amendments do not affect the allowability of the claims.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### **Claim Objections**

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner objects to Claim 86 and states that "the pair of the impurity regions" lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner suggests that the claim be corrected to read "the three impurity regions."

Applicant is amending Claim 86 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion which should overcome this objection. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner also states that Claim 86 would be allowable over the prior art if corrected to overcome the Examiner's objection. Since this claim has been corrected, it is respectfully requested that Claim 86 now be allowed.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner also rejects Claims 54-56 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner objects to the term “the semiconductor film” in Claims 54-56 and states that this term is inconsistent with a “semiconductor substrate” of the independent claims.

Therefore, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claims 54-56 to change “semiconductor film” to “semiconductor substrate.” It is respectfully submitted that this overcomes the Examiner’s objection, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

##### Claims 24 and 25

The Examiner also rejects Claims 24 and 25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. (US 4,004,159) in view of Tamaki et al. (US 5,885,872). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claim 24 to recite the feature of “wherein a length of the second impurity regions is longer than a channel length in a channel length direction.” This feature is supported by, for example, page 10, lines 1-6 which define channel length and Figs. 3 and 1C of the present application. For example, in Fig. 3, the length of the second impurity regions (304) is longer than a channel length (L) in a channel length direction. Further, in Fig. 1C, a length of the second impurity region (105) in a channel length direction is

longer than a distance between a source region (103) and a drain region (104) (i.e. a channel length).

In contrast, in Tamaki, the length of the second impurity regions (9) is not longer than the than the channel (10) length in a channel length direction. See e.g. col., 5, lines 24-26 and Figs. 5, 7A and 7B in Tamaki.

As the Examiner admits, Rai does not disclose at least two second impurity regions..., at least one channel region between the at least two second impurity regions, etc.

Therefore, independent Claim 24 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 24 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 28

The Examiner also rejects Claim 28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. together with Tamaki et al. and Choi et al. (U.S. 5,936,887). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 24, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 29, 30, 34 and 35

The Examiner also rejects Claims 29, 30, 34 and 35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. together with Tamaki et al. and Liu et al. (U.S. 5,814,854). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 29 and 34 in a similar manner as Claim 24 discussed above. Therefore, for similar reasons as discussed above for Claim 24, independent Claims 29 and 34 are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 29, 34 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 33 and 38

The Examiner also rejects Claims 33 and 38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. together with Tamaki et al, Liue et al. and Choi et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

These claims are dependent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 88-90. These claims are supported by, for example, page 8, lines 20-22 of the specification of the present application.

As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, as a RCE is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment and/or RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street - Ste. 2850  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568